**Gender Analysis of Innovation Platforms processes**

**First Kabele IP meeting, Endamekoni woreda agricultural office, Maichew, Nov. 1, 2014**

Effective functioning of the IPs and their ability to address the needs of men and women requires analysis of the processes within the IPs including how male and female members work together, which roles they fill and whether members are contributing equally. Different elements influence the proper functioning of IPs and the related outcomes (including communication, participation, decision making and role fulfillment). Information was captured through observation and documentation of the IP processes from a gender perspective, during the first Endamehoni IP meeting.

Categories of actors present: Technical kebele IP members, representatives of farmer research groups, gender champions, and ILRI/Africa RISING team (will get list of participants from Mohammed/Getachew)

Categories by sex: Women = 5, Men = 26

Protocols represented: apple, tree Lucerne, faba bean, potato seed multiplication and wheat

**Gender analysis of IP**

1. **Participation**

***Who are the talkative participants? Who are the quiet participants?***

* Men talked more than women but this could be attributed to the larger number of men present in the meeting
* The chairperson (Tibet kebele) and youthful development agent (DA) from Emba Hazi were more talkative. The chairman spoke about 6 times while the development agent spoke 4 times. One other man and a priest spoke twice. All the other men who spoke did it once. All the men spoke relatively longer than the women. On average, men spoke for about one minute. The kebele chairperson and DA seem to have spoken a little longer.
* Three women spoke. One of them spoke twice and the rest spoke once
* Some men nodded heads when other men (including the facilitators) spoke.

***Do you see any shift in participation were the talkative become quiet and the quiet suddenly become talkative? What are possible reasons for this in the IP's interaction?***

* There were both men and women who were quiet. There is need to explore more to know who they are.
* At the beginning of the meeting, women were quiet. After about 1 hour into the meeting, they started speaking, sharing their experiences about the trials. One of the issues that made women speak out is when the development agent praised the project for engaging women and how good this was. Women spoke to add to this point.

***How are the silent people treated? How is their silence interpreted?***

* No effort was taken to encourage the silent people to speak out.

***How are disagreements handled?***

***Who talks to whom? Do you see any reason for this in the IP's interactions? (this can also be captured during the break when member talk to each other)***

***Who keeps the discussions going? Why? Do you see any reason for this in the IP’s interactions?***

* The facilitators kept the discussion going to keep participants engaged and also ensure that they exhaust all the items on the agenda well in time

**Communication**

***Who talks? For how long? How often?* (Discussed above)**

* All the categories of actors talk (technical members and farmers group representatives) but more influential people in the community speak more often and longer e.g. the DA and kebele chairman. The men speak more and longer than the women.

**At whom do people look when they speak?**

It was difficult to observe this because of the sitting arrangement (classroom type) which prevents participants from facing each other. Members looked at the facilitators attentively. When members spoke, the rest of the participants seemed to look at the facilitators who were standing at the front of the room. The persons speaking did so while seated and other members did not take the initiate to see who was speaking. The members speaking looked at the facilitators and not the rest of the members in the room and the reverse was true.

**Who talks after whom? Who interrupts whom?**

* Men spoke after men. Women tended to speak after women. The sit coordinator spoke after the assistant site coordinator and the reverse is true. Below is the illustration of the order of speaking.
* Facilitator - M (Tibet kabele chairman) –M – M - M (Development agent)- M (youth) - Facilitator (G) - Facilitator (Mo) -Facilitator (G) – M - M (priest) – M – M - Facilitator (G) – M - M (priest) – W – M –M - M –M – Facilitator (Mo) – M (technical committee member) – Facilitator (G) – M (development agent) – W – W – Facilitators – M – M – M – Facilitator (M)- Facilitator (G) – closure.
  + M-male; W=woman;
* The development agent revealed that the project has taken the initiative to include women, which is good. This triggered two women to add to the point. One of the women stated: the project includes women household heads and women are involved equally as men which is good. The next woman added: before, men were considered superior to women but now, they are considered equally as the men. Women are informed earlier and the site coordinator gave focus on women to participate. The project is encouraging women to participate. This stimulated murmurs/buzzes in the room among men.
* The Tibet kabele chairperson interrupted more

**What style of communication is used (questions, assertions, tone of voice, gestures, etc.)?**

Both men and women use body gestures while expressing views. I did not notice any intonation. A couple of men nodded heads in affirmation.

***Who sits where? Do the same people always sit in the same place?***

* Men and women mixed

**Whose ideas are taken into account? Whose ideas are not taken into account?**

* When the facilitators responded to the concerns of the IP members, they checked back with the members to find out whether their questions/concerns have been adequately responded to. It’s mostly the men’s voices that was heard during affirmation.

1. **Decision making**

***How are decisions made? Does anyone make a decision and carry it out without checking with other IP members? Do members consult with each other?***

* The decision on when to hold the kebele and woreda IP meetings were done in consultation with all the members present. However, its men who proposed the number of times when the IPs meetings should be held. The kebele and woreda IP meetings will be held 4 times in a year. When the facilitators sought consent from members, all the men said yes (in loud voices) and no further consultation was made with the women.

***How do the preferences of men and women vary?***

* The facilitators did not inquire from the women what their preferences were e.g. when determining the number of IP meetings to be held. Men were louder and during affirmation, their voices stood out more and the facilitator did not check with the women.

***Do members drift from topic to topic? Do you see any reason for this in the IP's interactions?***

* The facilitators were systematic, following the items on the agenda. Members were not involved in developing the agenda.

***Who supports other members' suggestions or decisions? Does this support result into members deciding the topic or activity for the IP?***

***Is there any evidence of a majority pushing a decision through over other member's objections?***

* I did not observe this but I think men tend to push decisions without consulting with the women (due to language barriers, I can’t confidently say this but it’s close to what happened).

***Is there any attempt to get all members participating in a decision? What effect does this seem to have on the IP members?***

* Yes. Facilitators consults with the rest of the IP members. This increases acceptability of the decision.

***Is there anybody who makes contribution but does not receive any kind of response or recognition?***

* Due to language barrier, I am not sure whether all concern/questions were responded to

**Roles (due to language, I was not able to note this clearly)**

* ***Summarizes ideas?*** The facilitators??? (Due to language barrier, I might have captured this wrongly)**.**
* ***Who harmonizes ideas?*** The facilitators???
* ***Who seeks recognition?*** One male participate had his phone ringing about 4 times and did not respond to the members request to put it on silent mode ( I did not find out who he was)
* ***Who dominates discussion?*** More influential people - The Tibet kabele chairperson, Emba Hazi Development agent tended to dominate
* ***Who is the initiator of ideas?***
* ***Information seeker?***
* ***Information giver?*** Facilitators??
* ***Elaborator?*** Facilitators???
* ***Energizer?***
* ***Recorder?***
* ***Who encourages others?***
* ***Who compromises?***
* ***Who focuses on personal needs regardless of collective concerns?***
* ***Who is aggressive?***
* ***Who blocks others from contributing?***
* ***How are conflicts resolved?***
* ***Who is the mediator when conflicts arise?***